

REMARKS

Claims 1-78 are pending in the application.

Claims 19-21, 24, 27-43, 45, 52-57, 58, 60, 66-68, 71, 72, and 74 are withdrawn from further consideration.

Claim 10 has been cancelled herewith.

Claim 1 has been amended herewith. Applicants submit no new matter has been provided by way of this amendment.

Claim 11 (*sic*) (should read Claim 10) stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been rendered moot in light of the instant amendment, wherein Claim 10 has been cancelled, and Claim 1 has been amended to include a descriptor of the substrate in addition to the peel strength. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-18, 22, 44, 49-51, 55, 56, 59, 64, 65, 69, 70, 73, and 78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawabata *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,620,796). Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been rendered moot in light of the instant amendment, wherein claim 1 has been amended to include the peel strength of the polymers. Kawabata is silent at least as to this descriptor. All elements of Applicants' invention are not provided by Kawabata. A *prima facie* case of anticipation is not supported. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 23, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,620,796). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request withdrawal of same.

Applicants' invention provides polymers at least as described in Claim 1.

Kawabata provides acrylic adhesives/ Kawabata does not teach or suggest the polymers of Applicants' invention having the peel strength values as claimed. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 46-48, 61-63, and 75-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,620,796) in view of Gutman *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,508,107). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request withdrawal of same,

Applicants' invention is as described at least by Claim 1.

Kawabata provides acrylic adhesives.

Gutman provides pressure sensitive adhesives that are water resistant.

Kawabata and Gutman, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the polymers of Applicants' invention as now claimed. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 11-18, 44, 46-48, 49, 50, 51, 59, 61-63, 64, 65, 73, and 75-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Narimatsu *et al.* (EP 0530729 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request withdrawal of same.

Applicants' invention provides polymers at least as described by Claim 1.

Narimatsu provides pressure sensitive adhesives using an aziridine crosslinker. Narimatsu does not teach or suggest the polymers of Applicants' invention as now claimed. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 23, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narimatsu *et al.* (EP 0530729 A1) in view of Phan *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,969,032). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request withdrawal of same.

Applicants' invention is as described above.

Narimatsu provides pressure sensitive adhesives as described above. Narimatsu does not teach or suggest the addition of polymerizable surfactants as provided in Applicants' invention.

Phan teaches latex binders for coatings having a polymerizable surfactant. Phan does not teach or suggest the polymers of Applicants' invention.

Narimatsu or Phan, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the polymers of Applicants' invention. Further, there is no motivation to combine Narimatsu and Phan. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.


Claims 1-16, 44, 49, 50, and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 59,179,676 ('676 chemical abstract). Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been rendered moot in light of the instant amendment, wherein Claim 1 has been amended to include the peel strength of the polymers of the instant invention. The polymers of JP 59,179,676 have peel strengths of 820 g/ 20 mm. The polymers of Applicants' invention have a peel strength of less than 2.0 lbs/in (35.75 g/mm). All elements of Applicants' invention are not provided by the '676 abstract. A *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established and is not supported. Applicants request withdrawal of same.

CONCLUSIONS

Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

LATHROP & GAGE L.C.

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Janelle D. Strode", is written over a horizontal line.

Janelle D. Strode, Reg. No. 34,738
2345 Grand Boulevard, Suite 2400
Kansas City, MO 64108-2612
Tel: (816) 460-5859
Fax: (816) 292-2001
Attorney for Applicants